



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

write it, endeavored to make himself master of the facts by reading his various authorities, and then constructed it out of the materials thus fresh in his remembrance, and that he only referred on occasion to this or that authority when he recollected that there was a greater or less divergence among them. One statement of the writer that what Plutarch has from Xenophon "in the Artaxerxes was taken principally at second hand through some other source," seems very improbable. The fact that passages in which the very words of the *Anabasis* are quoted contain additional statements which Xenophon does not make, is surely inadequate to support the view that Plutarch had not Xenophon's work in his hands while he was compiling his material; particularly as Plutarch speaks in the highest terms of Xenophon as a narrator: c. 8, *Ξενοφάντος μονονουχὶ δεικνύοντος ὁφεί και τοῖς πράγμασιν ὡς οὐ γεγεννημένους ἀλλὰ γινόμενους ἐπιστάντος αἰετὸν ἀκροατὴν ἐμπροσθὴ και συγκινδυνεύοντα διὰ τὴν ἐνάρχειαν.*

The latter part of the treatise is devoted to the various accounts given of the battle of Kunaxa, the result of which is that the narrative of Xenophon is shown to be the most intelligible and consistent.

The tone of the whole essay leaves nothing to be desired; and though Mr. Smith has in this little treatise made an attempt to construct a theory on a very slender basis, he would no doubt subscribe to the dictum of a French writer who says: "la critique conjecturale a du bon, mais à la condition qu'elle ne se surfasse pas elle-même et qu'elle ne prétende point à la certitude."

C. D. MORRIS.

De arte metrica Commodiani. . . . Scripsit FRIDERICUS HANSEN (Doct. Diss.) Argentorati, 1881.

This volume of ninety pages contains an elaborate attempt to reduce to order the chaos of the miserable hexameters of Commodianus; but after reading the work, one is still constrained to believe with Lucian Müller, that the verses were written "contemptu fere regularum." As to the laws of quantity, the conclusion of Hansen is that they are observed only in the thesis of the second foot, and in the thesis of the fifth with the arsis of the sixth; but that even here the laws are totally different from those of classic Latin poets, and are not consistently applied! I cite as a sample one verse restored by Hansen:

Súscitantúrque soló||immortáles fácti de mórtē.

M. W. H.

Ueber den Einfluss des Reimes auf die Sprache Otfrid's besonders in Bezug auf Laut- und Formenlehre, von THEODORE INGENBLEEK. Mit einem Reimlexicon zu Otfrid. Karl J. Trübner, Strassburg, 1880.

Such is the title of a welcome little essay on the influence of rhyme upon Otfrid's language, a subject on which we have as yet only scattered remarks, found in the various commentaries and grammatical works on Otfrid's *Evangelienbuch*. It contains, as the title indicates, a rhyme-index and a list of the places cited, thus making it a convenient little book of reference to Otfrid. The purpose of the author has been rather to collect and arrange under

appropriate headings the cases where influence of rhyme has been at work, than to institute an investigation of the forms employed. This of course led to a division of the subject entirely according to outward signs, if I may be allowed the expression, and not according to inherent principles, which a purely scientific treatment of the subject would have demanded. It is much to be regretted that the author had not enlarged his plan to a discussion of the origin and value of the peculiar forms thus employed by this early and great poet, and to a comparison of them with similar forms in the sister dialects, inasmuch as the results of the investigation would then have been of more general interest, and in all probability many problems would have thus been solved, as many of the peculiar forms of the declension discussed in this essay have their exact counterparts in other sister dialects. This is a work that must still be done, and could have been done here with but little more outlay of time and research. Yet we will be thankful for the good we have received in this essay. It gives faithfully Otfried's peculiarities, and explains as many of them as the plan of the work admitted. And with this plan the division made is the best one possible, as it takes up in regular order the Verb, the Substantive and Adjective, the Adverb, the Participle, and lastly Syntax.

Let us take up some of these points in the order in which they occur. On p. 10 under Assimilation of two consonants we find *uuessîn* : *missîn* II, 5, 18 where *missîn* stands for *mistîn*, the common form of the past subjunctive. Kögel Germanische Dentalverbindung in P. B. VII 171-201 has formulated the law for the assimilation of a following to a preceding *s*. 1. The second *s* must necessarily be one of the accented suffixes *-tā-*, *-tī-*, *-tū-*. All words with *ss* were therefore oxytones in Teutonic. 2. The first *s* cannot have come from the original spirant *s*. 3. *ss* was always intervocalic in Teutonic, and here it must be remembered that *j* and *w* are vowels after a preceding long syllable, p. 173. Kögel farther explains the German *missen*, O. E. *missan*, O. N. *missa*, Teutonic *miss-ja-n* as formed from the part. *miss*, which, according to him, stands for "*mit-tā-s* and is the regular participle to *mīdan* (the Gothic would be *meipjan*)=Lat. *mītere* (in inscriptions *meitere*), now written *mittere*. The oldest meaning of this verb is '*fahren lassen*.' Thus we have *mīdan* : *missen* : *mittere* : *amittere*." But with a present *missjan* *missan* we should expect in the past tense of the O. H. G. *mistîn* and not our form *missîn*, and we find the first to be the regular form of the past tense. Accordingly we must either accept with Ingenbleek an irregular assimilation of *t* to the preceding *s* on account of the rhyme, or explain this uncommon form otherwise. The other forms which this word shows and not in rhyme lead us, however, to another explanation, which we shall find by accepting with Hermann Möller a *t*-praeteritum (*Kunpa* und das *T*-praeteritum in P. B. VII 457-481), who objects to Kögel's explanation of Gothic, O. N. *vissa*, O. E. *wisse*, O. H. G., O. S. *wessa* as an analogous formation (to similar forms in other words) formed from the old participle *viss*, which according to Möller is "really an adjective and not a participle, cf. German *gewiss*." Möller explains this form as a *t*-praeteritum from *vid* to see: thus *vittām vittāt* became according to Kögel's law regularly *vissa*. In the same way from the stem *mīd* (*carere*) we should have the praeteritum *mīttām mīttāt* from which the later *missa* would be the regular reflexion, and which the more common form *mista* from *missan* was gradually at this period superseding and

did finally entirely supersede. Thus Otfried made use of the one or the other form according to the needs of his verse.

p. 11. For the explanation of the *s* in *konsti* the collateral form to *konda* cf. Hermann Möller in P. B. VII 464 ff.

p. 12. For *firspurni* cf. Kluge in Q. F. 32, 145.

p. 13. For *sazta* cf. Hermann Möller cl. 479.

On the same page § 7 the subject of a change of gender or stem is treated, though only in so far as the metre has influenced the poet in the choice of one of two forms both of which have equal authority, or even sometimes to employ forms or a gender not found elsewhere. The author has not attempted an investigation into the cause of such change of an *a-* to an *i-* stem or *vice versa*, as this lay outside of the plan adopted by him. And yet this would have been a thankful investigation, though undoubtedly a somewhat extended one. It is in fact a question the solution of which would probably throw much light upon the complicated subject of anomalies and mixed forms in the declension. A glance at the O. H. G. substantives will suffice to show a frequent change between the *a-* (*ā-* *n-*) and *i-* stems, as in *finger*, d. pl. *fingeron*, *fingerin*, *nagel*, pl. *nagala*, *negeli*, *spanga*, pl. *spangi*, *stanga*, d. pl. *stangen*, ac. pl. *stanga*, *stangi*, *zanga*, pl. *zangi*, and many others. Some of these stems are stems which show consonant forms in Old Norse, and undoubtedly the fundamental cause is the same. It probably indicates a divergency in the development of one and the same, or a confounding of two distinct declensions, in the first case caused by difference in the place of the primary accent, in the second by the fact that some of the cases of the two different declensions became similar, which led to the confounding of the two declensions. Here we cannot enter more fully into a discussion of this very interesting subject, reserving what we have farther to say for some future occasion.

p. 21, § 10. I, 3, 37 *iro dāgo uuard giuudāgo fon altōn uutzagōn* "scheint nur eine licenz für das fem. *giuuaga*." Müllenhoff und Scherer Denk.² 436.

p. 22. *Maht* erscheint stets ohne umlaut, nur II, 17, 22 heisst es *mehti* (*krefti*). For the non-umlaut of *maht* cf. Braune Zur Althochdeutschen Lautlehre in P. B. IV, 541.

p. 23. *Magad* is as the author states on old *i-* stem, and the d. pl. *uueroltmaga-don* is probably to be explained by the dropping of the *i* after dentals (cf. On the Consonant Declension in Old Norse, above), and then transition into the *ā-* declension.

p. 24. In the d. sg. *akus* instead of *akusi* we have another instance of the dropping of the light vowel after *s* as discussed above p. 200 ff.

p. 26. The author is right in considering *duro* g. pl. for *turio*, and might also have cited the O. N. *dyrr* (pl.) in addition to the O. E. *duru* as proof of a *u-* stem (i. e. in O. H. G. an *i-* stem into which declension all the *u-* stems have passed in O. H. G.); farther O. S. ac. pl. *duri*=*januas*, Ps. 73, 6.

p. 29. n. pl. *fatera* after the *a-* declension is not merely a peculiarity of the O. H. G., but shows itself also in the other dialects, and especially in the plural of this word. O. Frise also has *fetera*, O. E. *fäteras*. It would repay the trouble of tracing the transition of these old consonant stems into the vowel declension throughout all the dialects, a research which would no doubt throw more light upon the question of the gradual disappearance of the consonant

stems. Most of the other *Tar-* stems have either passed as a general rule into the *u-* declension (cf. O. N. pl., O. E. and some forms of the O. Frise and O. H. G.) or remained intact in their old consonant declension (as for instance O. S., O. H. G. and O. Frise, the occasional *i-* forms excepted).

This word furnishes a good example of what I touched upon in my opening remarks, viz., the failure to take up and discuss the forms themselves in their philological relations to the whole Teutonic group. The mere fact that Otfrid used a form not in common use is interesting in itself, but receives an additional interest as soon as we learn that it is an historical form fast disappearing from the language, a relic of a conjugation or declension which is fast becoming obsolete, a landmark thus almost accidentally preserved, which greatly helps us in tracing the growth of the language. Otfrid probably invented no new forms for the occasion, but only employed uncommon ones taken from the unwritten or at least to us unpreserved language.

Though this failure to grasp the subject in its broadest sense detracts materially from the work, it does not by any means signify that it has been done in vain. It lays the foundation for farther investigation and is an invaluable aid in the study of Otfrid.

S. P.